

HW to Js, LF, Watergate coverage. Lesar told me today that a mutual friend who has seen the NYTimes, as neither of us have, tells him that for the past several days its coverage of what the Post reported ~~was~~ was more extensive, detailed. Post had a special correspondent with O'Brien at Annapolis, filed a full column(inside), without mention of his real blast on Nixon, Agnew and the caper. The Post did carry less than local TV on that, buried at the bottom of its story. AP B wire carried blast, short piece. No TV coverage tonight, but radio reports Wright Patman will use subpoenas if necessary to get the story out. Patman is an old timer with a reputation for exposing corruption that may exceed performance at mite. He might get some attention. His committee does have a legit jurisdiction. The unkindest cut dept: CBS TV gave a Mpls paper credit for breaking today a story Jack Anderson had in his column on the HHH source of that \$25,000. This also means, as I think Anderson noted, that the first accounting was fraudulent in time and source.

For your Freedom of Information info: there was an adverse decision yesterday that from the reporting (I've not seen text decision) seems to be a good and solid one. Rep. Les Aspin sought suppressed Peers My Lai report and was refused on basis investigatory-files exemption. Judge held this met fair test and in this gave first definition, "anything that can fairly be characterized as an enforcement proceeding." But raised this point in my spectro suit before the Ugh Chief Judge already described and asked the government attorney to specify the law being enforced. The response in itself should have made a story but was ignored: when a President is killed, there must be some law, natural or human. Wonder who enforces them? Believe it or not, Sirica held this met the investigatory-files exemption. Interesting that the court of appeals had been chewing this over so long. However, as with Gesell's decision in the Pent. Papers case, where he ^{used} language from the complaint in one of my suits, we can wonder if this (conservative) judge, Pratt, had read that transcript, for I don't know, unless Aspin did, as seems unlikely and counter-productive, where else Pratt would have come across this argument. If the government advanced it they're crazy for it will be quoted back endlessly. HW